



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/010,243      | 12/06/2001  | Scott C. Sanner      | 7784-000356         | 5792             |

27572 7590 03/18/2003

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ABRAMS, NEIL

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2839

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010243

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ✓
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Figs 1, 2, 3 must be labeled. *Prior Art.*

Spec page 3, lines 18, 19 seem incorrect; fig. 4 cover appears much larger than fig 2 cover. Fig 5, cover 40 should be noted by numeral, should mounting means be shown in fig. 5?

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claims 1, 10, 15, attachment or mounting structure for the cover and claim 2 "same specification" feature must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

No specific mounting structure (brackets, etc) for the cover is shown or disclosed. Fig <sup>5</sup> is confusing and cannot be relied upon.

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application.

Claim 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 2839

The claims are based on a non-enabling disclosure. Without clear disclosure of the attachment or connections means used to mount the cover just how to make and use the invention is uncertain.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Robinson, Spielman, Gevaert, Pritchard, Luu and Thompson.

Prior Art, Figs. 1, 2, 3 a show an outlet box cover 32 for aircraft seat use. It would have been obvious to form such cover with plural connections for electronics in view of Robinson at 9, 29. Headphones are read as portable electronic devices. Also, obvious to form the cover with multiple data outlets in view of Gevaert, at 46, col. 7, line 45-54, Pritchard, fig. 3, Thompson, fig 4 and Luu, figs. 4, 5. For claim 15, also obvious to use a cover with an opening for the present power port in view of Thompson at 16, 18, 66. Spielman added to further show how outlet wiring 44 would extend to a power box at 50. Obvious to use such device in prior art assembly.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gavaert alone or in view of Pritchard, Luu and Thompson.

Obvious to use Pritchard seating structure, with plural data outlets <sup>(fig 9)</sup> on vehicles of different types (busses, airplanes). Other patents applied as above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

N ABRAMS/pj

03/13/03

*N. Abrams*  
N. ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322